

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/698,798 10/27/00 STEVENS M 585-1017

MM91/0730

WILLIAM M LEE JR
LEE MANN SMITH MCWILLIAMS SWEENEY & OHLS
P O BOX 2786
CHICAGO IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER

PITTS, H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 07/30/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application r
proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/698798

Applicant(s)

JOHNSON ET AL.

Examiner

HAROLD R. H.

Group Art Unit

2876

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2876

Rejections will be based on the following criteria the criteria for applicant and/or counsel is ordinary skill in the art, i.e., a knowledge of all prior art including the ability to read, comprehend and to point out the claimed invention compared to the prior art concepts. The applicant is considered to have the pertinent prior art before him during conception and reduction to practice of the invention in light of this prior art including drafting the specification and claims. The applicant is considered to be aware that to merely substitute or additionally employ one or more teachings of one or more references before him in a combinational sense would clearly be within the purview of obviousness, the motivation being the skilled artisan's recognition of the interchangeable teachings of similar systems and the expedient of the substitutive or an additive employment of one or more prior art system concepts to provide a particular solution or to bring about a desired result.

35 U.S.C. 112 rejections:

- a. The disclosure, like the claims must point out the invention. A disclosure in which the lexicography is unclear. Vague, convoluted or incomplete does not comply with the statute.
- b. A disclosure which merely discusses prior art concepts without really setting a forth on independently arrived at enabling disclosure does not comply.
- c. Claims based on disclosure as above or are vague, incomplete or merely expressions or desired results do not comply with the statute.

35 U.S.C. 103 rejections and motivation.

Art Unit: 2876

The criteria here is a skilled artisan who is looking first to the prior art for aid in the conception and reduction to practice phase of inventing and who is technologically skilled in the research of patent and other documentation and in the employment of prior art concepts in substitutive and additive combinations to address and implement a system, having collected and subjected the pertinent prior art (such as cited here in) and viewing the prior art technique of employing the desired inventive concepts in or more combinations to provide successfully similar solution and which considered in combination address applicant's essential inventive concept, would find in such an addressing the "suggestion" or "suggestions" or "motivation" that the prior art concepts might be successfully employed in combination as set forth in applicant's claims.

35 U.S.C. 102 rejections;

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2876

Claims 1-23 are rejected as discussed above in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by Nova, Hass and the Moh patents. Any assertion of novelty should be discussed as to patentable significance over the prior art considered in toto.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Harold Pitts at telephone number (703) 308-0717.

Pitts/nt

7/23/01



Harold I. Pitts
Primary Examiner